

2.2.3

(שאף הן היו באותו הנס) 23a → (אמר רב יהודה) 22a

1. ואיש איש מבני ישראל ומן הגר הגר בתוכם אשר יצוד ציד חיה או עוף אשר יאכל וישפך את דמו ויכסהו בעפר: ויקרא יז, יג
 2. מחוץ לקרקת העדת באהל מועד יערף אתו אהרון מערב עד בקר לפני ה' תמיד חקת עולם לדורותיכם: ויקרא כד, ג

- I. Discussion re: using light of נר חנוכה
- a. נר חנוכה ruled that it is forbidden to count coins using **דב אסי**
 - b. נר חנוכה – should be no prohibition **שמואל** there is no sanctity to נר חנוכה
 - i. **ד' יוסף** (of חיה ועוף דם) also has no sanctity; yet v. 1 teaches that we cover דם with hands; not to degrade מצוה
 1. Question: posted to ריב"ל – if we may benefit from adornments to סוכה
 2. נויי סוכה they forbade using נר חנוכה (implication – same applies to נויי סוכה)
 - a. **ד' יוסף**: why is he explaining that which is already in a ברייתא (of ריב"ל) with a מימרא (of ריב"ל)?
 - b. Rather (ר' יוסף): the model for all is דם (v. 1)
- II. 3 disputes רב/שמואל; in each case רב takes the stringent position
- a. נ"ח חנוכה מנר לנר: whether we may light נר חנוכה from another נ"ח
 - i. Analysis (student before רב): רב's reason is that it degrades the מצוה (ר"אב"א)
 - ii. Response (ר"אב"א): incorrect – his reason is that it causes a deficiency in the (original) מצוה
 1. Point of difference: if he lights directly from candle to candle – not a ביזוי, but is מכחיש ("takes away")
 - iii. Challenge (ר' אביא): תוספתא מע"ש א:א: – may not use a מע"ש coin to counterweigh gold coins, even for the purpose of חילול of other מע"ש
 1. Analysis: no refutation if we agree that רב/שמואל dispute a case of lighting directly from candle to candle
 - a. In which case: שמואל would agree to forbid using a stick to get fire from נ"ח to light another
 - b. But if: שמואל even allows using a stick (or match), then this תוספתא refutes him
 2. Defense (רב): this is due to a precaution; if the coins don't balance each other, may use/keep them as חולין
 - iv. Challenge (ר' ששת): v. 2 teaches that the מנורה – not needed for light (as ה' light led them) was עדות of the שכינה
 1. And: that עדות is the western light, which was used to light all the others
 - a. And: since the נרות were fixed in place, had to light using a קינסא – challenge to both positions (of רב)
 - b. Defense (ר"פ): could have used long wicks
 - i. Nonetheless: this is a challenge to רב according to the position of מצוה – הכחשת מצוה
 - v. Resolution (ר' יהושע): הנהח עושה מצוה, we may light נר לנר; הנחה עושה מצוה, we may not
 - vi. Per: question posed as to whether the lighting or the placing of נר חנוכה constitutes the מצוה
 1. Proposal: רבא ruled that if he was holding נ"ח – accomplished nothing (→ הנחה עושה מצוה)
 - a. Rejection: someone who sees him will think that he is lighting for his own purpose
 2. Proposal: רבא ruled that if he lit inside and took it outside – accomplished nothing
 - a. Analysis: if we rule that הנהח עושה מצוה, we understand it must במקומו
 - i. But if: הנהח עושה מצוה – why did he accomplish nothing?
 - ii. Rejection: again, someone who sees him will think that he is lighting for his own purpose
 3. Proposal: ריב"ל ruled that if a lantern was lit all of שבת (of חנוכה), after שבת, he extinguishes and lights it
 - a. Analysis: if הנהח עושה מצוה, this ruling is understood
 - i. But if: הנהח עושה מצוה, he should have to extinguish, lift up, put down and light
 4. Furthermore: since our ברכה is ... להדליק → הנהח עושה מצוה
 - a. Application: if a חש"י lights נ"ח – accomplished nothing
 - b. However: women certainly light, per ריב"ל's ruling that women are חייבות in נ"ח as they were also involved in the נס (either as agents of the miracle or as survivors of the threat)
 - b. מתירין מבגד לבגד: whether we may take ציצית from one garment to put on another
 - c. דבר שאינו מתכוין: whether we rule like ר"ש, who allows דבר שאינו מתכוין on שבת (e.g. pulling bench, 'tho it may "plow")
 - i. רב always followed רבא (in איסורים) except in these 3 cases